

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application, new claims 7-11 having been added as indicated herein. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that independent claim 5 is allowed. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mano et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,793,366). Applicant traverses these rejections at least for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Mano does not teach or suggest at least “receiving a predetermined signal that indicates changes in the operation states of the server devices from the server devices by the client device and displaying the change in the operation state of a specific server device on a screen thereof,” as recited in claim 1. That is, nowhere does Mano disclose that a “client device” receives a predetermined signal that indicates changes in the operation states of server devices and displays the change in the operation state of server devices. In a network, a client device is, for example, a computer that uses the services provided by a server. Mano only discloses that a graphical user interface (GUI) is displayed on a display device to display graphical images representing devices coupled to a network system. However, Mano does not disclose that the GUI or display device is a client device that uses the services provided by a server on the network.

Further, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Mano does not teach or suggest at least “receiving a predetermined signal that indicates changes in the operation states of the server devices,” as recited in independent claim 1. That is, the predetermined signal as set forth in claim 1 is different from the type of signal that is shown in Mano. In the present

invention, as recited in claim 1, the predetermined signal indicates changes in the “operation states” of the server devices, whereas, on the other hand, the signal of Mano only indicates a state of connection or disconnection. *See col. 5, lines 5-16* of Mano. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Mano.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. Applicant submits that independent claim 6 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 2, the Examiner alleges “Mano teaches detecting the presence of the client device by monitoring said communication channel that determines that a new device has just been coupled to the bus. Mano obviously teaches wherein the client device establishes [a communication channel] with respect to the server device via a polling method (col. 5, lines 7-16)”. In response, Applicant submits that col. 5, lines 7-16 clearly states that a host system displaying a GUI receives a communication that is sent across the serial bus when a new device is coupled to the serial bus. Nowhere, however, does Mano teach or suggest that the host, or display device, performs any other functions relating to establishing a communication channel with a server device besides simply receiving a communication signal. In other words, Mano does not teach or suggest establishing a communication channel by periodic polling. Therefore, at least based on these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over Mano.

Finally, Applicant adds new claims 7-11, as indicated herein, to round out the scope of protection solicited for the present invention. Applicant submits that new claim 7 is patentable

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLICATION NO.: 09/445,769

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q57164

for reasons similar to allowed claim 5, as claims 7 and 5 recite similar patentable limitations.

New claims 8-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 6.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: July 3, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Diallo T. Crenshaw", written over a horizontal line.

Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778